4.12 RECREATION

This section identifies potential impacts on recreational land uses at Ames Research Center and its immediate surroundings from each of the five alternatives. This section also proposes mitigation measures to reduce or eliminate identified impacts.

A. Standards of Significance

An alternative for the NASA Ames Development Plan (NADP) would have a significant impact with regard to recreational uses if it would:

- Impact the quality of existing recreational resources.
- Substantially reduce the amount of active recreation or passive recreation area within Ames Research Center, thus leading to an increase in use of surrounding recreational areas by people living or working at the Center.

B. Impact Discussion

This section discusses the potential recreational impacts of each of the five proposed alternatives. Parkland calculations are shown in Table 4.12-1.

1. Quantity of New and Existing Parkland

a. Alternative 1

Under Alternative 1, there would be no change from the baseline in the quantity of the existing recreational resources at Ames Research Center because there would be no new development.

b. Alternative 2

Under Alternative 2, approximately 4.7 hectares (11.5 acres) of park space would be added in the NRP Area, as well as 4.6 hectares (11.4 acres) of new active recreation space in the Bay View area for a total of 9.3 hectares (22.9 acres). The passive open space in the Bay View area, part of which is used for

TABLE 4.12-1 **PARKLAND CALCULATIONS**

	Alternative					
	1	2	3	4	5	Mit. Alt.5*
Proposed New Parkland hectares (acres)	0	9.3 (22.9)	4.7 (11.5)	7.6 (18.9)	14.1 (34.9)	14.1 (34.9)
New Residents	0	2,009	1,266	2,574	2,808	4,909
Demand Rate	1.2 hectares (3 acres) per 1,000 residents					
New Demand hectares (acres)	0	2.4 (6.0)	1.5 (3.8)	3.1 (7.7)	3.4 (8.4)	5.9 (14.7)
New Employees	0	13,068	11,047	15,599	7,222	7,088
Demand Rate	0.6 hectares (1.5 acres) per 1,000 employees					
New Demand hectares (acres)	0	7.8 (19.6)	6.7 (16.5)	9.4 (23.4)	4.3 (10.8)	4.3 (10.6)
Total New Demand hectares (acres)	0	**10.2 (25.6)**	**8.2 (20.3)**	**12.5 (31.1)**	**7.7 (19.2)**	**10.2 (25.3)**
Surplus or Deficit hectares (acres)	0	**-0.9 (-2.7)**	**-3.5 (-8.8)**	**-4.9 (-12.2)**	**6.4 (15.7)**	**3.9 (9.6)**

* For a full analysis of Mitigated Alternative 5, see Chapter 5.

walking, would decrease by 20.4 hectares (50.5 acres), leaving a total of approximately 17.8 hectares (43.9 acres) of open space. Given the amount of available walking space remaining, however, this would not constitute a significant impact.

Under Alternative 2, no additional active parkland would be lost. However, under this alternative, one hole of the golf course would be removed to accommodate the Regional Disaster Training Center. This would be a significant impact unless the golf course were reconfigured.

Alternative 2 would add new residents and employees, who would generate a total demand for 10.2 hectares (25.6 acres) of new parkland, using a standard demand rate of 1.2 hectares (3.0 acres) per 1,000 residents and 0.6 hectares (1.5 acres) per 1,000 employees. Alternative 2 would supply 9.3 hectares (22.9 acres) of new parkland for a deficit of 0.9 hectares (2.7 acres).

c. Alternative 3

Under Alternative 3, new development would be concentrated entirely in the NRP area, and there would be 4.7 hectares (11.5 acres) of new park space built. None of the existing open space in the Bay View area, which is currently used by employees for walking, would be removed. Alternative 3 would add new residents and employees, who would generate a total demand for 8.2 hectares (20.3 acres) of new parkland. Alternative 3 would thus generate a parkland deficit of 3.5 hectares (8.8 acres).

d. Alternative 4

Under Alternative 4, approximately 4.7 hectares (11.5 acres) of park space would be added to the NRP area, as well as approximately 3.0 hectares (7.4 acres) of active recreational space in Bay View, for a total of 7.6 hectares (18.9 acres). Approximately 32.9 hectares (81.2 acres) of existing undeveloped land in the Bay View area would be developed, leaving a total of approximately 5.4 hectares (13.4 acres) of open space. Given the amount of available walking space remaining, however, this would not constitute a significant impact.

Under Alternative 4, no additional active parkland would be lost. However, under this alternative, one hole of the golf course would be removed to accommodate the Regional Disaster Training Center. This would be a significant impact unless the golf course were reconfigured.

Alternative 4 would add new residents and employees, who would generate a total demand for 12.5 hectares (31.1 acres) of new parkland. Alternative 4 would supply 7.6 hectares (18.9 acres) of new parkland for a deficit of 4.9 hectares (12.2 acres).

e. Alternative 5

Alternative 5 proposes the addition of approximately 6.4 hectares (15.7 acres) of new park space to the NRP area, as well as approximately 4.6 hectares (11.4 acres) of new active recreational space in the Bay View area and approximately 3.2 hectares (7.8 acres) in the Ames Campus area for a total of 14.1 hectares (34.9 acres).

Approximately 15.9 hectares (39.4 acres) of existing undeveloped land in the Bay View area would be developed, leaving a total of approximately 22.35 hectares (55.23 acres) of passive open space, which would continue to accommodate trails and walking. Given the amount of available walking space remaining, this would not constitute a significant impact. No additional active parkland would be lost under this alternative.

Alternative 5 would add new residents and employees, who would generate a total demand for 7.7 hectares (19.2 acres) of new parkland. Alternative 5 would supply 14.1 hectares (34.9 acres) of new parkland for a surplus of 6.4 hectares (15.7 acres).

2. Quality of Existing and New Parks at Ames Research Center

There would be no negative effects on the quality of any existing or proposed parks or open spaces, except for temporary noise impacts due to construction.

3. Cumulative Impacts

The cumulative projects listed in Chapter 2 would bring new employees and residents to the region. These people would be able to use the many regional recreational facilities described in Section 3.12. Given the large supply of existing recreational sites, no cumulative impacts on recreation are expected.

Moreover, the NADP would include a surplus of recreational lands, so it would not add to any cumulative impact that might occur.

C. Impacts and Mitigation Measures

This section lists the mitigation measures for each potential impact discussed above.

Impact REC-1: Alternatives 2 through 4 would not supply enough new recreational space to meet demands generated by new employees and residents.

Applicable to: Alternatives 2 through 4

Mitigation Measure REC-1: NASA and/or its partners would develop additional active recreation areas in development areas on the ARC site to meet recreation demands generated by new employees and residents.

Impact REC-2: Alternatives 2 and 4 would result in removal of one hole from the golf course to accommodate the Regional Disaster Training Center.

Applicable to: Alternatives 2 and 4

Mitigation Measure REC-2: The golf course would be reconfigured to accommodate a full 18 holes.